DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 472 UD 028 226

AUTHOR Davidson, Mary E.; And Others
TITLE Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation's An Analysis of the Composition and Participation of the Core Planning Teams of Project CANAL. First Quarter of Year 2 (1989-1990).
INSTITUTION Chicago Public Schools, IL. Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation.
PUB DATE Jan 90
NOTE 57p.; For a complete set of Commission Reports, see UD 028 213-233.
PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Budgets; Community Control; Compliance (Legal); Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education; *Management Development; *Participant Characteristics; *Participative Decision Making; Program Evaluation; *School Based Management; *School Community Relationship; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Chicago Public Schools IL; Project CANAL

ABSTRACT

This evaluation analyzes the composition and participation of the core planning teams of Project Creating a New Approach to Learning (CANAL), part of a court-mandated desegregation plan to reduce inequities in predominantly Black and Hispanic American schools in Chicago (Illinois). The report covers activities during the first quarter of CANAL's second year. CANAL's goal is to organize and train core planning teams, the representative bodies of the school community, to engage in shared decision-making and to develop organizational structures that incorporate the community in the organizational and educational processes of the schools. The teams were to be composed of parents, teachers, principals, ancillary school staff, and community members. The problems noted in the first year's evaluation persisted, confirming the failure of CANAL. The following findings are presented: (1) teachers continued to dominate the teams and representation of ancillary staff, parents, and community members did not improve; (2) students were added to the teams at three high schools and two elementary schools; (3) there was substantial turnover in team members from year 1 to year 2; (4) about 42 percent of the members of the core planning teams in year 2 were new; (5) 16 percent of team members also were elected to local school councils (LSCs); and (6) there was a sharp decline in the attendance of principals and teachers at year 2 training sessions. Statistical data are presented in 17 tables. A description of the monitoring commission staff and a budget are appended. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED336472

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation

MONITORING PROJECT CANAL:

FIRST QUARTER PROGRESS REPORT OF YEAR 2 (1989-90)

Submitted to the United States Department of Education

January 1990

Mary E. Davidson
Principal Investigator

Donn F. Bailey
Commission Chairperson

ED 028226

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Leadership Oasis/92
Monitoring CMM

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Donn F. Bailey, Chairperson

Nancy M. Abbate	Jesse Miller
Maxine Duster	Uthman Muhammad
Mari Fohrman	Donnell Peterson
Carlos Heredia	George Riddick
Gwendolyn Laroche	Aida Sanchez
Henry Martinez	Darthula Young

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

Mary E. Davidson

COMMISSION STAFF

Barbara Anglin

Helen Jackson

Barb Leebens-Osilaja

Christy Spears

Ana Tapia

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation
1819 West Pershing Road
6th Floor East
Chicago, Illinois 60609
(312) 890-8220

CONTACT PERSON:
Helen Jackson
(312) 890-8220

January 1990

AN EXECUTIVE ABSTRACT

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation's

AN ANALYSIS OF THE COMPOSITION AND PARTICIPATION OF THE CORE PLANNING TEAMS OF PROJECT CANAL

First Quarter of Year 2
(1989-1990)

This progress report covers Project CANAL activities for the period of September through the beginning of December 1989.

The problems of the composition and participation of core planning teams noted for Year 1 by the Monitoring Commission persisted in Year 2:

- **CORE PLANNING TEAM COMPOSITION**
  - Teachers continued to dominate the teams, and the representation of ancillary staff, parents and community did not improve.
  - The CANAL proposal suggested that students could be represented on the core planning teams of high schools. Students were added to five core teams but only three of them were high schools while the other two were elementary schools.

- **PARTICIPANT TURNOVER FROM YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2**
  - There was substantial change in core planning team members from Year 1 to Year 2 of Project CANAL:
    - more than 78 percent of community representatives left teams;
    - 62 percent of parents resigned;
    - 33 percent of ancillaries left teams;
    - 28 percent of the teachers left the teams; and
    - 22 percent of the principals left the core teams.
    - about 38 percent of the Year 1 members left the teams.

- **NEW CORE PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS**
  - About 42 percent of the members of the core planning teams in Year 2 were new. The new members represented:
  - 80 percent of the community representatives;
  - 60 percent of the parents;
  - 35 percent of the ancillaries;
  - 33 percent of the teachers; and
  - 22 percent of the principals.
- **LOCAL SCHOOL COUNCILS**
  - 16 percent of core planning teams members also were elected to LSCs.
  - 46 percent of the parents and community members on core planning teams also were on an LSC.
  - 16 of the 56 community members were on an LSC.
  - 99 of 193 parents were on an LSC.
  - 47 of 535 teachers were on an LSC.
- **YEAR 2: DAY 1 TRAINING**
  - There was a dramatic decline in attendance of principals with only 49 percent attending compared to 95 percent in Year 1.
  - Teacher attendance also declined to 82 percent compared to 95 percent in Year 1.
  - Ancillary attendance declined to 38 percent.
  - Parent attendance was only 53 percent.
  - Only two of 61 community members attended.
  - Thus, the low level of attendance established by ancillaries, parents and community members was compounded by a drop in attendance by principals and teachers.

- o **YEAR 2: DAY 2 TRAINING**
  - There was no improvement in attendance across all categories of attendance.
- o **YEAR 2: TOTAL SITE TRAINING**
  - Ancillary staff, parents, community members continue to display low levels of attendance.

Even though CANAL staff knew that the core planning teams did not comply with the CANAL proposal in Year 1, they failed to rectify the problem in Year 2.

There is no evidence that CANAL provided the 425 new members Year 2 with training that would give them knowledge equivalent to members continuing from Year 1 with some understanding.

Attendance data for Year 2 suggested a decrease of interest and commitment to CANAL on the part of principals and teachers.

The attendance data continued to confirm the failure of CANAL to involve ancillary staff, parents, and community members on core planning teams which were the key to the CANAL proposal.

The 58-page progress report was completed under the direction of Dr. Mary E. Davidson, principal investigator, and primary consultant, Dr. Norman R. Kurtz. It has been submitted to the United States Department of Education. Reference copies are available at the Monitoring Commission office, 1819 W. Pershing Road, 6th Floor East, Chicago, IL 60609.

PREFACE

This is the fifth progress report done by the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation to satisfy requirements of the $83 million Settlement Fund proposal. This report, written for the United States Department of Education, is an analysis of the composition and participation of core planning teams of Project CANAL in the first quarter of the second year of implementation (1989-90).

The analysis was done under the direction of myself and the primary consultant, Dr. Norman R. Kurtz. On-site monitoring was done by Monitoring Commission staff personnel, Barbara Anglin, Barb Leebens-Osilaja, and Christy Spears. Other Commission staff who assisted in this report include Helen Jackson and Ana Tapia.

Mary E. Davidson
Principal Investigator

January 1990

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION'S

MONITORING PROJECT CANAL: FIRST QUARTER PROGRESS REPORT OF YEAR 2 (1989-90)

Mary E. Davidson, Principal Investigator
Norman R. Kurtz, Primary Consultant

January 1990

Prepared under the direction of
Mary E. Davidson, Principal Investigator,
Monitoring Commission for
Desegregation Implementation
Chicago Public Schools
Chicago, Illinois

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

COMPOSITION OF CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 2 3

Representation of Key Constituencies 4
Changes in Membership of Core Planning Teams: Year 2 17
Representation of LSC Members on Teams 24

PARTICIPATION IN YEAR 2 TRAINING 27

Core Planning Team Workshop: Day 1 28
Core Planning Team Workshop: Day 2 35
Core Planning Team Total Site Training 43

SUMMARY 49

APPENDICES 50

LIST OF TABLES

Composition of Core Planning Teams: Year 2

Table 1 - Composition of the 41 Core Planning Teams: Year 2 5

Table 2 - Changes in the Composition of Core Planning Teams: Year 1 to Year 2. 7

Table 3 - Change in Representation of Key Constituencies 41 Core Planning Teams: Year 1 to Year 2. 15

Table 4 - Comparison of the 41 Core Planning Teams: Year 1 and Year 2 Ancillary Staff, Parents, and Community Members 16

Table 5 - Turnover in the 41 Core Planning Teams Year 1 to Year 2. 21

Table 6 - Continuing and New Members on the 41 Core Planning Teams - Year 2 22

Table 7 - Composition of the 41 Core Planning Teams Percentage of New Members in Year 2. 23

Table 8 - Representation of LSC Members on the 41 Core Planning Teams Continuing and New Members: Year 2. 26

Participation in Year 2 Training

Table 9 - Participation in Core Planning Team Workshops Year 2: Day 1, September 28 to October 10, 1989 30

Table 10 - Participation in Core Planning Team Workshops: Year 2 Representation of Key Constituencies on Day 1. 34

Table 11 - Participation in Core Planning Team Workshops: Year 2 Representation of Ancillary Staff, Parents, and Community Members in the 43 Core Team Sessions on Day 1. . . . 36

Table 12 - Participation in Core Planning Team Workshops Year 2: Day 2, September 26 to October 27, 1989 38

Table 13 - Participation in Core Planning Team Workshops: Year 2 Representation of Key Constituencies on Day 2. 41

Table 14 - Participation in Core Planning Team Workshops: Year 2 Representation of Ancillary Staff, Parents, and Community Members in the 43 Core Team Sessions on Day 1 . . . 42

Table 15 - Participation in a Special Three Day Workshop by Six Core Teams Year 2: September 25, 26, and 27 44

Table 16 - Participation in Total Site Training: Year 2 17 Core Planning Teams: School and Category of Participants . . . 45

Table 17 - Participation in Total Site Training: Year 2 Representation of Ancillary Staff, Parents, and Community Members for 18 Sessions 48

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to present the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation's analysis of the composition and participation of core planning teams of Project CANAL in the first quarter of the second year of implementation. Project CANAL was based on the belief that the best way to improve levels of academic achievement in racially identifiable schools was to develop a model for school governance that included the support and participation of key stakeholders in the educational system.

Using the concepts of school-based management and shared decision-making, Project CANAL proposed to organize core planning teams that represented the primary constituencies within each school. The CANAL proposal specified that each core team would include the principal, at least one teacher from each grade level, at least three ancillary staff (building engineers, lunchroom managers, clerks, teacher aides, school aides and others), a minimum of five parents, and two community representatives. It also was suggested that students could be placed on the teams of high schools participating in CANAL. A total of 41 schools were selected to take part in the Project CANAL during the first year.

During the first year of CANAL core planning teams were organized, received basic training which included one day of orientation, two days of training in school-based management and shared decision-making, and one day of total site training where the broader school community participated with the core planning team in a one day training session. The first year's primary product of each core planning team was a school improvement plan for its school. The school improvement plan, based on an analysis

of problems within the school, was to consist of specific plans for addressing the problems in order to raise standards of academic achievement.

Project CANAL encountered substantial problems in implementing the proposed program during Year 1, particularly with respect to core planning teams. At the outset, CANAL failed to compose the teams with the constituencies described in the proposal. In particular, community members were seriously underrepresented while parents and ancillaries also showed substantially smaller numbers on the teams than provided for in the proposal.

The inadequate composition of the teams with respect to the required constituencies was further compromised by the failure of the underrepresented constituencies to participate in scheduled training activities for core planning teams. Community members played almost no role in the training activities, while parents and ancillaries only played a minor role. The overall impression of an analysis of attendance data was that in practice CANAL primarily was concerned with teachers and their principals.[1] Given the difference between those who attended and those who were supposed to be on the teams, it was clear that CANAL was unable to implement the model presented in the proposal. The core planning team, that was intended to provide the leadership to assist the local school to improve academic achievement, did not materialize.

---

[1] For a full review of the composition and participation of core planning teams in Year 1 see The Year-End Progress Report of Monitoring Project CANAL: An Analysis of the Composition and Participation of Core Planning Teams, the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation, January 1990.

The purpose here is to report on CANAL's activities in Year 2. In particular, changes in the composition of core planning teams and their participation in the training activities of CANAL during the first quarter of Year 2 will be analyzed. Given that core planning teams were the center piece of CANAL, and constituted CANAL's method for implementing school-based management, a continued update on core planning teams is important. It also must be kept in mind that core planning teams represented the hopes of CANAL for changing local school management in order to improve academic achievement in the 41 participating schools.

The first part of the report will analyze changes in the composition of core planning teams of the 41 schools participating in CANAL. The second part of the report will present an analysis of the participation in CANAL activities by those individuals who were placed on core planning teams. The data on participation for activities that took place from the first of September (the beginning of Year 2 of CANAL) into early December. While it represents only the first quarter of the second year, the results may be seen as suggestive of what will take place during the second year of CANAL.

COMPOSITION OF CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 2

Given the problems that CANAL experienced during the first year in composing core planning teams according to the proposed model, it was anticipated that properly constituted teams would have a high priority for Year 2. The composition of the Year 2 teams will be reviewed first with regard to appropriate representation and, second a description of the changes in membership that took place.

Representation of Key Constituencies

Table 1 details the composition of the 41 teams for Year 2 and shows that the school principal and a substantial number of teachers were included on each team. There was considerable variation in the number of teachers, however, in that some teams had 10 or fewer, with one having only seven teachers while other teams had more than twenty teachers. The number of teachers on a team is important because during Year 1 many of the teams were so large that it was difficult to imagine how they could meet their responsibilities. And, teachers were by far the most numerous on the teams. Fewer teachers would have been the most likely means for reducing the size of large teams. However, Table 1 indicates that little was done to limit the number of teachers on teams.

The CANAL proposal suggested that core teams for high schools could have student representatives. Only five teams included students, but only three of the five were high schools including Kelvyn Park, Orr, and Westinghouse. Two elementary schools had student representatives on core planning teams, Dumas with seven students and Sumner with two. The two other high schools participating in CANAL, DuSable and Robeson, did not have students on their teams. It is not clear what problems would be created by including elementary students on teams, especially in the case of Dumas, with seven students. At a minimum, the active participation of seven elementary students could complicate the team's capacity to meet its obligations.

Ancillaries were more likely to be represented on Year 2 teams than was true during Year 1. Only one team, Orr, had fewer than the three ancillary staff required by the CANAL proposal. Parent representatives still fell far short of the proposal

Table 1

COMPOSITION OF THE 41 CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 2*

School	P	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	TOTAL
Bass	1	11		1	1	1	1	1	9	1	27
Bennett	1	12		1	1	1			7	2	25
Bradwell	1	14		1	1	1	1	1	6	3	29
Byford	1	10		1	1	1	1	1	2	1	19
Carter	1	8		1	1	1	1	1	6		20
Clark	1	11		1	1	1	1		6	5	27
Cooper	1	7		1	1	1	1	1	4	2	19
DePriest	1	10		1	1	1	1	1	4	2	22
Dett	1	6		1	1	1			5		15
DuBois	1	13		1	1	1	1		3		21
Dumas	1	15	7	1	1	1	1		4	2	33
DuSable	1	23		1	1	4	1				31
Dyett	1	16		1	1	1	1		5	2	28
Fernwood	1	11		1	1	1	1	1	6	3	26
Frazier	1	11		1	1		2		6	3	25
Gale	1	18		1	1	1			1	1	24
Goldblatt	1	12		1	1	1	1	1	5	2	25
Gregory	1	14		1	1	1	1		4		23
Guggenheim	1	10		1	1	1	1		7	3	25
Hammond	1	16			1	1	1	1	6		27
Hearst	1	10		1	1	1	1	1	3	2	21
Howe	1	14		1	1	1	2	1	5		26
Hughes	1	12		1	1	1	1		4	1	22
Jungman	1	9		1	1		1	1	3		17
Kelvyn Park	1	10	2	1	1	1		1	2	2	21
Lafayette	1	13		1	1	1	1				18
Lowell	1	13		1	1	1	1	1	7		26
Manierre	1	8		1	1	1	1	1	4	1	19
Mayo	1	10		1	1	1	1		5	2	22
Moos	1	11		1	1	1	1	1	4	3	24
Orr	1	23	1			1			2	1	29
Piccolo	1	19		1	1	1		1	5	1	30
Robeson	1	10			1		3		7		22
Sherman	1	15		1	1		2		3	1	24
Spencer	1	14		1	1	1	3		4		25
Stowe	1	15		1	1		1		7	2	28
Sumner	1	9	2	1	1	1	1		6	1	23
Terrell	1	21		1	1	1	2	2	9	2	40
Westinghouse	1	17	2	1	1	1	2		5	2	32
Williams	1	19			1	2	1	1	5	1	31
Woodson	1	15		1	1	1	1	1	7	2	30
TOTAL	41	535	14	37	40	40	44	21	193	56	1021

*Information on the core planning team compositions was provided by the staff of the CANAL Project.

P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; TOTAL=the number of members on each team.

requirements. Five teams included no parents while 16 teams had fewer than the required minimum of five parents. Community members continued to fare the worst with as many as 11 teams having no community representatives and another ten having only one such representative.

Table 2 provides a much more revealing description of the recomposition of core planning teams in Year 2. The table shows the number of members continuing from the first year, the number of new members on each team, the number of Year 1 members who were discontinued in Year 2, and the number of members, both old and new, who were elected to LSCs (Local School Councils). The LSCs were created in response to a school reform bill adopted by the State of Illinois whereby each school was mandated to elect a body of parents, community members and others to assist in governing the school. The similarity in function of the LSCs and core planning teams of CANAL is striking and represents a separate issue of concern for monitoring and analysis. The concern here is to document the extent to which LSC members were also members of core planning teams.

The body of Table 2 details the members on each team. The column labeled ST1 shows the number of members on each team that continued from Year 1. Thus, Bass school had 21 members from Year 1 who continued on the team in Year 2. Column ST2 shows how many new members were placed on each team. Again, Bass received six new members. The column headed TOT shows the total number of members on each team in Year 2. Bass had 21 continuing members and six new members for a total of 27 members.

Table 2

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2

School	P	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	ST1	ST2	TOT	ST3	ST4
Bass									5	1	21				
Continuing	1	10		1	1	1	1		4			6	27		
New		1						1	4					5	
Discontinued		1							2c2n						6
LSC	1c	1c													
Bennett									2	1	15				
Continuing	1	10				1			5	1		10	25		
New		2		1	1				4					7	
Discontinued		1		1	1				1c	1c1n					6
LSC	1c	2c													
Bradwell									2		7				
Continuing	1				1	1	1	1	4	3		22	29		
New		14		1					5	1				20	
Discontinued		11				1	1	1	2c4n						9
LSC	1c	2n													
Byford									1		11				
Continuing		8			1		1		1	1		8	19		
New	1	2		1		1		1	2					7	
Discontinued	1	3		1					1c1n						4
LSC	1n	1c													
Carter									2		15				
Continuing	1	8		1	1		1	1	4			5	20		
New						1			7					13	
Discontinued		4				1	1		1c4n						7
LSC	1c	1c													
Clark										2	13				
Continuing		8		1	1		1		6	3		14	27		
New	1	3				1			5					9	
Discontinued	1	2				1			6n						8
LSC	1n	1c													
Cooper									2		12				
Continuing	1	6		1	1		1		2	2		7	19		
New		1				1		1	1	2				5	
Discontinued						1	1		1c	1n					4
LSC	1c	1c													

P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; LSC=members elected to the Local School Councils.

ST1=number continuing from year 1; ST2=new members in year 2; TOT=total of continuing and new members; ST3=number of members discontinued from year 1; ST4=number of year 2 on LSC.

The lower case c and n in the rows of LSC refer to the Local School Council members who are c=continuing from year 1 and n=new members in year 2.

Table 2 continued

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 AND YEAR 2

School	P	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	ST1	ST2	TOT	ST3	ST4
DePriest															
Continuing	1	S		1	1	1	1	1	2		16				
New		2							2	2		6	22		
Discontinued		2							3					5	
LSC	1c	1c							2c	2n					6
Dett															
Continuing	1	5			1	1			4		12				
New		1		1					1			3	15		
Discontinued		1		1										2	
LSC	1c								4n						5
DuBois															
Continuing	1	9			1	1					12				
New		4		1			1		3			9	21		
Discontinued		5		1			1		2	1				10	
LSC	1c	2c							3n						6
Dumas															
Continuing	1	10			1	1			1		14				
New		5	7	1			1		3	2		19	33		
Discontinued		4		1			1		4	1				11	
LSC	1c	2c							1c1n						5
DuSable															
Continuing	1	21									22				
New		2		1	1	4	1					9	31		
Discontinued		12												12	
LSC	1c	2c													3
Dyett															
Continuing	1	14		1	1		1		2	1	21				
New		2				1			3	1		7	28		
Discontinued						1			3					4	
LSC	1c	2c							1c2n						6
Fernwood															
Continuing	1	8		1	1	1	1	1	3		17				
New		3							3	3		9	26		
Discontinued		1							2					3	
LSC	1c	2c							2c3n	2n					10

P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; LSC=members elected to the Local School Councils.

ST1=number continuing from year 1; ST2=new members in year 2; TOT=total of continuing and new members; ST3=number of members discontinued from year 1; ST4=number of year 2 on LSC.

The lower case c and n in the rows of LSC refer to the Local School Council members who are c=continuing from year 1 and n=new members in year 2.

Table 2 continued

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 AND YEAR 2

School	P	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	ST1	ST2	TOT	ST3	ST4
Frazier											8				
Continuing	1	6			1										
New		5		1			2		6	3		17	25		
Discontinued		8		1			1	1	5	2				18	
LSC	1c								4n						5
Gale											15				
Continuing	1	13				1									
New		5		1	1				1	1		9	24		
Discontinued		3		1	1		1		3					9	
LSC	1c								1n	1n					3
Goldblatt									2		14				
Continuing	1	8		1		1	1								
New		4			1			1	3	2		11	25		
Discontinued		5			1					2				8	
LSC	1c	1n							2c1n						5
Gregory									3		14				
Continuing	1	7		1	1		1		1						
New		7				1			4			9	23		
Discontinued		1				1			1c					6	
LSC	1c	1c1n													4
Guggenheim											12				
Continuing	1	9				1	1								
New		1		1	1				7	3		13	25		
Discontinued				1	1				5					7	
LSC	1c	1c								1n					3
Hammond											14				
Continuing		9			1	1	1	1	1						
New	1	7							5			13	27		
Discontinued	1	1		1					5					8	
LSC	1n	1c							1c						3
Hearst											11				
Continuing		7				1	1	1	1						
New	1	3		1	1				2	2		10	21		
Discontinued	1	2		1	1		2		3	1				11	
LSC	1n	1c							1c1n						4

P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; LSC=members elected to the Local School Councils.

ST1=number continuing from year 1; ST2=new members in year 2; TOT=total of continuing and new members; ST3=number of members discontinued from year 1; ST4=number of year 2 on LSC.

The lower case c and n in the rows of LSC refer to the Local School Council members who are c=continuning from year 1 and n=new members in year 2.

Table 2 continued

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 AND YEAR 2

School	P	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	ST1	ST2	TOT	ST3	ST4
Howe															
Continuing		9		1	1	1	2	1	3		18				
New	1	5							2			8	26		
Discontinued	1	7							2					10	
LSC	1n	1c1n							1c1n						5
Hughes															
Continuing	1	9		1	1		1		2	1	16				
New		3				1			2			6	22		
Discontinued		2				1								3	
LSC	1c	2c							1c2n	1c					7
Jungman															
Continuing	1	8						1	3		13				
New		1		1	1		1					4	17		
Discontinued		1							2	1				4	
LSC	1c								1c						2
Kelvyn Park															
Continuing		2		1	1			1	1	1	7				
New	1	8	2			1			1	1		14	21		
Discontinued	1	11				1	1		7	2				23	
LSC	1n	1n	1n												3
Lafayette															
Continuing	1	10			1		1				13				
New		3		1		1			6	1		5	18		
Discontinued		5		1										13	
LSC	1c														1
Lowell															
Continuing	1	10				1	1	1	7		21				
New		3		1	1							5	26		
Discontinued		3		1	1									5	
LSC	1c	1c							1c						3
Manierre															
Continuing	1	5		1		1	1	1	3	1	14				
New		3			1				1			5	19		
Discontinued					1				4	2				7	
LSC	1c	2n							1n						4

P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; LSC=members elected to the Local School Councils.

ST1=number continuing from year 1; ST2=new members in year 2; TOT=total of continuing and new members; ST3=number of members discontinued from year 1; ST4=number of year 2 on LSC.

The lower case c and n in the rows of LSC refer to the Local School Council members who are c=continuing from year 1 and n=new members in year 2.

Table 2 continued

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 AND YEAR 2

School	P	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	ST1	ST2	TOT	ST3	ST4
Mayo					1	1	1		3		14				
Continuing	1	7							2	2		8	22		
New		3		1					1	3				6	
Discontinued		1		1											4
LSC	1c								2c1n						
Moos					1	1	1		1		12				
Continuing	1	7						1	3	3		12	24		
New		4		1					5	2				11	
Discontinued		3		1					1c1n	1n					4
LSC	1c														
Orr									1		9				
Continuing	1	7							1	1		20	29		
New		16	1			1			2					2	
Discontinued															4
LSC	1c	2n	1n												
Piccolo											16				
Continuing	1	11		1	1	1		1	5	1		14	30		
New		8												16	
Discontinued		8				1	2	2	1	2					5
LSC	1c	1c1n							2n						
Robeson									2		16				
Continuing	1	10					3		5			6	22		
New					1									8	
Discontinued		2		1	1				4						3
LSC	1c								1c1n						
Sherman					1		1		3		12				
Continuing	1	6					1			1		12	24		
New		9		1					3					5	
Discontinued		1		1					3c	1c					6
LSC	1c	1c													
Spencer					1	1	1		1		13				
Continuing	1	8					2		3			12	25		
New		6		1					2					7	
Discontinued		4		1											5
LSC	1c	1n							1c2n						

P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; LSC=members elected to the Local School Councils.

ST1=number continuing from year 1; ST2=new members in year 2; TOT=total of continuing and new members; ST3=number of members discontinued from year 1; ST4=number of year 2 on LSC.

The lower case c and n in the rows of LSC refer to the Local School Council members who are c=continuing from year 1 and n=new members in year 2.

Table 2 continued

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 AND YEAR 2

School	P	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	ST1	ST2	TOT	ST3	ST4
Stowe					1		1		2		9				
Continuing		5							5	2		19	28		
New	1	10		1					2					19	
Discontinued	1	14		1		1			1c5n	1n					9
LSC	1n	1c1n													
Sumner						1	1		3		13				
Continuing	1	7							3	1		10	23		
New		2	2	1	1				5	2				8	
Discontinued		1							1c2n	1n					6
LSC	1c	1c													
Terrell									3	2	30				
Continuing	1	17		1	1	1	2	2	6			10	40		
New		4							4	1				6	
Discontinued		1							2c1n						5
LSC	1c	1c													
Westinghouse									1		16				
Continuing		11		1		1	2		4	2		16	32		
New	1	6	2		1			1	2	1				7	
Discontinued	1	1			1										2
LSC	1n		1n												
Williams						2	1	1	4	1	21				
Continuing		12							1			10	31		
New	1	7			1				7	7				24	
Discontinued	1	6		1	1			1	2c						4
LSC	1n	1n													
Woodson									1		17				
Continuing	1	12			1	1		1	6	2		13	30		
New		3		1			1		5					7	
Discontinued		1		1					6n	2n					11
LSC	1c	1c1n													
TOTALS	41	535	14	37	40	40	44	21	193	56	596	425	1021	371	206

P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; LSC=members elected to the Local School Councils.

ST1=number continuing from year 1; ST2=new members in year 2; TOT=total of continuing and new members; ST3=number of members discontinued from year 1; ST4=number of year 2 on LSC

The lower case c and n in the rows of LSC refer to the Local School Council members who are c=continuing from year 1 and n=new members in year 2.

Column ST3 shows how many members were discontinued on each team. Note that the number of new members and discontinued members are not necessarily equal. Bass, see ST2, added six new members, but dropped only five members from Year 1, see ST3.

Column ST4 shows how many members of core planning teams also were elected to an LSC. Bass had six such members. Note also that members who were on an LSC may either have continued from Year 1 or were new members in Year 2. The row displaying LSC members indicates whether the LSC person was continuing (with a lower case c) and whether they were new (with a lower case n). Bass, for example, had a principal who continued from Year 1 and was on an LSC, and one teacher who was elected to an LSC who also had continued on the core planning team from Year 1. Bass also had four parents who were elected to the LSC, two of whom were continuing and two new to the core planning team.

The bottom of the last page of Table 2 shows the total number of constituents in each category on the 41 teams. Thus, the teams included 41 principals, 535 teachers, 14 students, etc. The column labeled TOT shows that there were 1,021 members on the 41 teams. Of these, ST1 shows that 596 continued from Year 1, and ST2 shows that 425 were new to the teams. Column ST3 indicates that 371 persons who had been on the teams in Year 1 were discontinued. The total number of individuals who were both on the core planning team and on an LSC was 206, as shown in the total for ST4.

The sums indicate that there was substantial change across the 41 teams. Did the changes correct or compensate for the problems of representation on core teams that CANAL encountered during the Year 1?

Table 3 presents the number of members across the categories of constituents to be represented on the teams for Years 1 and 2. The table shows clearly that no real improvement in representation took place. Teachers, who already were overrepresented in Year 1, increased their number even more, from a total of 496 to 535; ancillaries increased slightly, from 177 to 182, while the number of parents declined slightly; and, community members added only six members to the handful of 50 who were on the teams in Year 1.

The overall totals are informative, but of greater concern is whether the constituencies properly were represented within each of the 41 teams. Table 4 provides some insight into that matter. The table also compares the representation of constituencies on the teams for Year 1 and Year 2 of CANAL. The table shows that while there were some gains in the underrepresented groups, the composition of the teams still fell far short of the proposal requirements.

Ancillaries, for example, met the minimum of at least three members on each team in Year 2 in all cases except one, and that team had two members. In the first year, two teams had no ancillaries, one had only one, and another had only two.

Only 23 teams had the minimum of five parents, see Table 1, while Table 4 shows that 32 teams had at least four parents. In the first year only 29 had at least four parents. As many as nine teams still had three or fewer members who were parents in Year 2. This had been true for 11 teams in Year 1.

The constituency still most likely to be absent from the teams in Year 2 was community members. Only 20 of the 41 teams had two or more community members

Table 3

CHANGE IN REPRESENTATION OF KEY CONSTITUENCIES
41 CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2

Category Of Constituent	Members In Year 1		Members In Year 2	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Principals	41	4.2	41	4.0
Teachers	496	51.3	535	52.4
Ancillaries*	177	18.3	182	17.8
Parents	203	21.0	193	18.9
Community Members	50	5.2	56	5.5
Students	-	-	14	1.4
TOTALS	967	100.0	1021	100.0

*Ancillaries include building engineers, lunch room managers, clerks, teacher aides, and school community representatives.

Table 4

COMPARISON OF THE 41 CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 AND YEAR 2
ANCILLARY STAFF, PARENTS, AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS

Category Of Constituent	Number Of Constituents On The Team									
	0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Year		Year		Year		Year		Year	
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
Ancillary Staff*	2	0	1	0	1	1	5	4	32	36
Parents	2	2	1	0	3	3	6	4	29	32
Community Members	17	12	11	9	7	13	4	5	2	2

*Ancillary staff include building engineers, lunch room managers, clerks, teacher aides, and school community representatives.

in Year 2. While that was an improvement over Year 1 when only 13 teams had that many, as many as 12 teams still had no community members in Year 2.

The evidence shows that CANAL staff failed to address the problems of representation that they encountered in Year 1. The failures of the first year, while somewhat less dramatic in Year 2, persisted. As a consequence CANAL entered its second year of implementation without core planning teams that the proposal described as essential to initiate school-based management.

While the failure to represent the various constituencies on the teams was a serious matter, another issue of concern was the turnover in team membership from Year 1 to Year 2.

Changes in Membership of Core Planning Teams: Year 2

Changes in team members for Year 2 of CANAL were important in that most of the resources and activities of Year 1 were dedicated to training the members of core planning teams to engage in school-based management. Given the investment of time and money for Year 1 training, it would seem important that the majority of members continue as long as possible. The first year also was important in that it provided the members with the time and opportunity to learn to work together as a team. Turnover in members would threaten to destroy the gains made in team-building and much of the investment in training during the Year 1 would be lost.

Table 2 provides a detailed description of all changes in membership. Examination of column ST1 and ST2 shows how many members continued on each team, and how many new members were appointed. Of the 1,021 team members in Year 2, only 596 continued from Year 1 while as many as 425 were new to the teams. The

column ST3 shows how many members discontinued from each team. A total of 371 individuals were discontinued. The rows across the table, labeled continuing, new, and discontinued show the changes that took place within each team.

From the perspective of project resources and training the new members represent individuals who are not prepared to function on the team. Not only must they be trained so they have knowledge equivalent to continuing members of the teams, but they must be integrated with the other team members. This represents a substantial additional investment of CANAL funds.

Whereas the new members represent added training costs, discontinuing members represent a loss in expended resources. The benefits of the training they were provided and the effort extended helping them develop team-building skills are lost to Project CANAL. It could be argued that discontinuing members will benefit personally from the experience and may even use the experience to influence what takes place in the local school. But, for the practical purposes of CANAL, they are a lost investment in bringing about school-based management.

The detail in Table 2 is useful, but it is difficult to get a good picture of the character of the changes that occurred. Table 5 provides a more succinct view by summarizing the number of continuing and discontinued team members in terms of the primary constituencies involved. The table shows that principals, teachers and ancillaries were most likely to continue while parents and community members were most likely to leave.

Thus, 39 of the 50 community members, or more than 78 percent of those trained in Year 1, were no longer available to the teams by Year 2. And, as many as 62

percent of the parents on the teams, 126 out of 203, were lost at the end of Year 1. The high turnover on the part of community members and parents compounds the problems of their underrepresentation on the teams during Year 1. Not only were there far too few of them in Year 1, but most of those who were there left at the end of the year. Or from another perspective, most of the parents and community members on core teams in Year 2 have not had Year 1 training and are not integrated into the teams. Input to core planning teams from these two constituencies in Year 2 must be substantially discounted.

While the turnover of ancillaries, teachers and principals was much lower, 32.8 percent, 28 percent and 22 percent respectively, the number still represents a major loss in terms of the Year 1 effort. The numbers are substantial enough to add up to a major reconstitution of core planning teams.

Discontinuing members represent the lost investment in core planning teams for Year 1. New core team members require an additional investment to integrate them into the teams and remold the teams into effective working units. Table 6 indicates the percentage of new members with respect to the basic categories of constituents.

Just as parents and community members were most likely to leave core teams after Year 1, they are most likely to be new to the teams in Year 2. Of the 193 parents on core teams in Year 2, 116 were new and only 77 continued from Year 1. For the most part, community members were new in that 45 of the 56 community members on the teams in Year 2 were new and only 11 continued from Year 1. Given that parents and community members are least likely to be knowledgeable about their local schools

and are far outnumbered by teachers, their status as new members leaves them with a major handicap.

There was no indication from materials available to the Monitoring Commission that CANAL staff had developed plans for bringing newcomers up to speed with the continuing team members. The training that is being offered in Year 2 appears to be a continuation of Year 1 activities and seems to presume that all team members are at the same level of knowledge and skills.

Teachers and ancillaries were less likely to be new but new members among their ranks still represented substantial percentages, 33.3 percent and 34.6 percent, respectively. Note also that there was a substantial gain in the number of new teachers on the teams. Only 139 discontinued, Table 5, while 178 new teachers were added. The overall impression of the data in Tables 5 and 6 is that teachers will be even more dominating on core planning teams in Year 2 than they were in Year 1. The hope for shared governance among a broad constituency of the school community seems more wishful.

Table 6 also shows that 14 students were added to core teams. Table 1 shows the 14 students were distributed across three high schools and two elementary schools. It is difficult to know what the role of elementary students will be on the teams, particularly in the case of the Dumas School which has seven such members.

Table 7 displays more boldly the character of the problem of turnover. The Table categorizes core planning teams by the percentage of new members on the teams using 20 percent intervals. Only two schools had 20 percent or fewer new members, 19 schools had between 21 and 40 percent new members, 15 had between 41 and 60 percent newcomers, and five had 61 to 80 percent new members. As many as 20 of the 41

Table 5

TURNOVER IN THE 41 CORE PLANNING TEAMS
YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2

Category Of Constituent	Total*	Continuing		Discontinued	
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Principals	41	32	78.0	9	22.0
Teachers	496	357	72.0	139	28.0
Ancillaries**	177	119	67.2	58	32.8
Parents	203	77	37.9	126	62.1
Community Members	50	11	22.0	39	78.2
Totals	967	596	61.6	371	38.4

*The total here refers to the number of individuals on the core teams in the first year. The continuing and discontinued columns indicate the proportion that continued on the team in year 2 and discontinued their membership on the team in year 2.

**Ancillaries include building engineers, lunch room managers, clerks, teacher aides, and school community representatives.

Table 6

CONTINUING AND NEW MEMBERS ON THE 41 CORE PLANNING TEAMS
YEAR 2

Category Of Constituent	Total*	Continuing Members		New Members	
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Principals	41	32	78.0	9	22.0
Teachers	535	357	66.7	178	33.3
Ancillaries**	182	119	65.4	63	34.6
Parents	193	77	39.9	116	60.1
Community Members	56	11	19.6	45	80.4
Students	14	0	0.0	14	100.00
	1,021	596	58.4	425	41.6

* The total refers to the total number of individuals on the core teams for year 2. Continuing members are those who participated in year 1 and new members are those who came to the core team in year 2.

**Ancillaries include building engineers, lunch room managers, clerks, teacher aides, and school community representatives.

Table 7

COMPOSITION OF THE 41 CORE PLANNING TEAMS
PERCENTAGE OF NEW MEMBERS IN YEAR 2

	Precentage Of New Members			
	0-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%
Number Of Teams	2	19	15	5
Percentage Of Teams	4.9	46.3	36.6	12.2

teams replaced more than 40 percent of their Year 1 members. These figures make clear the losses in team training expenditures for Year 1 and the extent of new resources that will be required to reconstitute the teams in Year 2.

While there are several methods for dealing with the problem, none are undesirable. For example, the newcomers could be ignored, and treated like continuing members, but this would jeopardize their individual capacity to contribute and threaten the teams' ability to function. Or, the newcomers could be trained separately to give them knowledge and skills equivalent to that of continuing members. But, it would be both costly and would not offer the opportunity for an integrative training experience with continuing team members. All the members of the newly constituted teams could be retrained as a group, but that would involve a considerable expenditure of time and effort, and likely would not be welcomed by continuing members.

The training activities that have been monitored over the first few months of Year 2 indicate that CANAL is going forward with training as though all members had experienced the first year of training.

Representation of LSC Members on Teams

During the past year the State of Illinois enacted the School Reform law which requires each school to be represented by a council of representatives including parents, community members and students. Principals are de jure members of the Councils. The newly mandated Local School Councils (LSCs) were elected by the communities of the local schools in the fall of 1989. Their function and representative character is somewhat parallel to core planning teams of CANAL. The concern here is the extent to which individuals on core planning teams were also elected to the LSCs.

Table 2, as part of the detailed description of the composition of core planning teams, displays the number of LSC members on each team. Table 8 summarizes the representation of LSC members across the constituent groups of core planning teams. The table shows who served on core teams during Year 1 and continued to serve in the second year and were elected to an LSC, and those who are new to core teams in Year 2 and were elected to an LSC.

The percentage of parent members who were also members of the LSC is striking. More than half, 51.3 percent, of all parents on core planning teams are also on an LSC. Note that only about a third of these, 37, were continuing members while 62 of those new to core planning teams also were elected to the LSC. It is not clear whether the large number of parents on LSCs came about because of some design on part of CANAL staff or the parents themselves. It remains to be seen what the role and impact of the LSCs will be on the local school level and what their relationship will be to CANAL.

Table 8 also shows that 16 of the 56 community members were elected to an LSC and most of them, 13 of the 16, were new members to core planning teams. The total number of community members is so small that even with the high joint membership on LSCs they are not likely to exercise a major influence across the 41 core planning teams.

Of the 535 teachers on core teams, 47 were elected to LSCs. Most of the 47 LSC members, 32, continued on the core teams from Year 1. Principals were automatically placed on the LSCs while none of the ancillary staff had any of their members elected to LSCs.

Table 8

REPRESENTATION OF LSC MEMBERS ON THE 41 CORE PLANNING TEAMS
CONTINUING AND NEW MEMBERS: YEAR 2

	Total Members	Continuing Members: LSC		New Members: LSC		Total LSC	
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Principals	41	0	0	0	0	41	100.0
Teachers	535	32	6.0	15	2.8	47	8.8
Ancillaries*	182	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Parents	193	37	19.2	62	32.1	99	51.3
Community Members	56	3	5.4	13	23.2	16	28.6
Students	14	0	0.0	3	21.4	3	21.4
	1,021	72	7.0	93	9.1	206	20.2

*Ancillaries include building engineers, lunch room managers, clerks, teacher aides, and school community representatives.

PARTICIPATION IN YEAR 2 TRAINING

Introduction

The analysis of Year 1 CANAL activities indicated that there was a great difference between who was on a core planning team and who actually participated in CANAL training. The results from Year 1 showed that the most underrepresented participants on the team, parents and community members, were also least likely to attend CANAL training activities.[2] Review of the composition of the teams at the start of Year 2 showed that the underrepresentation of non-school personnel was unchanged from Year 1. Will participation in training activities show improvement in Year 2, or will the pattern from Year 1 prevail?

Data on participation during Year 2 was available for the period of September through early December 1989. The training provided to core planning teams included a workshop of two days, and one day of total site training which took place with each team and their entire school staff. Data for the latter were not complete, but the sessions for which data were available provide some evidence of the level of participation during the first quarter of Year 2. A final section will provide a description of additional CANAL training activities that did not involve entire core teams.

---

[2] An analysis of core team members in the training activities of CANAL is available in the Monitoring Commission's report, The Year-End Progress Report of Monitoring Project CANAL Year 1: An Analysis of the Composition and Participation of Core Planning Teams, January 1990.

Core Planning Team Workshop: Day 1

The core planning teams were divided into nine groups for Day 1 training. Some of the groups had as many as seven teams attending while others had as few as two, Table 9. The number of teams involved in a session seemed independent of the number of members on the individual teams. The session that included seven teams would have had 176 persons present if all core team members had come, but only 112 showed up. The session involving only two teams would have had only 46 if everyone had attended, but only 40 came. An appropriate concern is whether arrangements for training were more driven by the exigencies of scheduling or some other consideration than by didactic concerns.

Analysis of Day 1 training was complicated in that six schools, Bradwell, Carter, Dett, DuBois, Goldblatt, and Sherman participated in a three-day session rather than the Day 1 and Day 2 sessions. Further, the training they received was different in that it was lead by an outside consultant who did not meet with any of the other teams. The sessions were described to Monitoring Commission staff as special and too expensive to provide to all teams. The criteria or reasons for providing the six core teams with a unique three-day training experience were not provided to the Monitoring Commission.

The data also showed that two schools, Bradwell and Hearst, attended twice on Day 1 training. Bradwell took part in the special three-day session described above as well as the regular Day 1 session while Hearst participated in two of the regular sessions. A review of the attendance sheets showed that essentially the same persons from the two schools attended both times. The reasons for the duplicate participation of these two teams are unknown. In constructing the tables on attendance, the duplicate participation

by two teams had to be taken into account. Thus, while the Table 1, on team composition, showed a total of 1,021 members for the 41 core teams, the total number of potential attendees, given the double attendance by two schools, was actually 1,071 (See the footnote on Table 9).

Table 9 shows who attended Day 1 training. The column totals on the last page of the Table show the total number for each constituency. The total shows that 682 out of a potential 1,071 individuals, or 64 percent, attended Day 1 training. The row totals in the column labeled Total shows how many attended from each team, while CPT shows how many members were on each team, and DIFF represents the difference between the number on each team and the number who actually attended the training session.

Table 10 summarizes attendance across the constituent groups. The attendance of principals declined notably from Year 1. Only 21 of the potential 43 principals came to the workshop (43 principals could have attended. While there were only 41 teams, two teams attended twice and if each team were accompanied by their principal a total to 43 principals would have attended). The decline in their presence represents a major change from Year 1. For example, Table 8 in the Monitoring Commission's report, The Year-End Progress Report[3] showed that 39 out of 40 principals on core teams attended Day 1 training. And in no instance did less than 37 out of a possible 41 show up for any of the Year 1 training sessions. In contrast, we find here, in the first major training effort of Year 2, as many as 22 instances in which principals failed to accompany their core teams.

---

[3] The Year-End Progress Report of Monitoring Project CANAL Year 1: An Analysis of the Composition and Participation of Core Planning Teams, January 1990, p. 27.

Table 9

PARTICIPATION IN CORE PLANNING TEAM WORKSHOPS*

YEAR 2: DAY 1, SEPTEMBER 28 TO OCTOBER 10,1989

Date And School	Category Of Participant														
	P	AP	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	OTHER**	TOTAL	CPT	DIFF
September 25															
Bradwell***			9				1			4			14	29	-15
Carter			6	1					1	4			12	20	- 8
Dett	1		4				1			4			10	15	- 5
DuBois	1	1	13		1	1							17	21	- 4
Goldblatt			12				2	1		2			17	25	- 8
Sherman	1		14				2			3			20	24	- 4
September 28															
Hammond			11					2	1	1			15	27	-12
Hearst***		1	9				1	1		3			15	21	- 6
Lowell	1		8					1	1	5			16	26	-10
Piccolo		1	14							4		1	20	30	-10
Sumner			7				1	1		2			11	23	-12
October 2															
Bass								2		1			14	27	-13
Byford	1	1	9					1		2	1		13	19	- 6
Dumas	1		8					1		2			20	33	-13
Hughes	1	1	15					1		3			11	22	-11
Manierre			7				1	1		4			14	19	- 5
Spencer	1	1	6				1	1		4			17	25	- 8
Williams	1		10					1	1	2	1		23	31	- 8
	1		17												
October 4															
Cooper			8					1	1	4			14	19	- 5
Gregory	1		9							5			15	23	- 8
Jungman	1		10					2		1			14	17	- 3
Lafayette			10					1		1			12	18	- 6
Moos		1	13					1		1			16	24	- 8
Stowe			13	1	1			2					17	28	-11

* The data on attendance was provided by staff of the CANAL Project. The core planning teams of schools trained on September 25 received three days of training in this series whereas teams of all other schools received two days. For purposes of comparison, the first two days of attendance for teams receiving three days of training are included with the teams receiving only two days.

** The other for Piccolo was a security guard.

***Bradwell attended both on September 25 and on October 16; Hearst attended both on September 28 and on October 16. It is not clear why they attended twice.

P=principal; AP=assistant principal; T=teacher; S=student; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher assistant; SCR=school community representati CM=community member; TOTAL=sum of members of a team attending; CPT=total number of individuals on each team; DIFF=the difference between the number of attendees and members of each team; PAR= parents.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 9 continued

PARTICIPATION IN CORE PLANNING TEAM WORKSHOPS*

YEAR 2: DAY 1, SEPTEMBER 28 TO OCTOBER 10,1989

Date And School	Category Of Participant												TOTAL	CPT	DIFF
	P	AP	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	OTHER			
October 10															
DuSable			23				1	1					25	31	- 6
Westinghouse		1	15				1	1	1	4			23	32	- 9
October 12															
Bennett		1	10										11	25	-14
Clark			11		1			1					13	27	-14
DePriest	1		8		1	1		1	1	4			17	22	- 5
Fernwood	1		10							1			12	26	-14
Frazier			1										1	25	-24
Mayo	1	1	9				1	1		2			15	22	- 7
October 16															
Bradwell**			12			1				10			23	29	- 6
Hearst **		2	9							3			14	21	- 7
Kelvyn Park	1	1	8						1	2			13	21	- 8
Orr	1		13				1			2			17	29	-12
October 18															
Dyett			16			1		1		5			23	28	- 5
Guggenheim	1	1	9				1	1					13	25	-12
Howe		1	12					2	1	1			17	26	- 9
Terrell			14		1			1	2	3			21	40	-19
Woodson	1	1	11				1		1	2			17	30	-13
October 26															
Gale	1	1	15		1		1			1			20	24	- 4
Robeson	1		11					2		6			20	22	- 2
	21	17	459	2	6	4	17	33	12	108	2	1	682	1071	-389

* The data on attendance was provided by staff of the CANAL Project. The core planning teams of schools trained on September 25 received three days of training in this series whereas teams of all other schools received two days. For purposes of comparison, the first two days of attendance for teams receiving three days of training are included with the teams receiving only two days.

**Bradwell attended both on September 25 and on October 16; Hearst attended both on September 28 and October 16. It is not clear why they attended twice. Note that the total core planning team members is 1071 whereas the original teams were 1021. The difference in this table is due to the teams of Bradwell and Hearst being counted twice.

P=principal; AP=assistant principal; T=teacher; S=student; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher assistant; SCR=school community representati PAR=parent; CM=community member; TOTAL=sum of members of a team attending; CPT=total number of individuals on each team; DIFF=the difference between the number of attendees

Ancillary school staff also made a poor showing with only 38 percent of them attending Day 1 training. Again it represented a downward decline, although modest, from their already low attendance rates during Year 1. In the two sessions of Year 1 that are comparable to this session in Year 2, 42 and 48 percent came for training.[4] While the decline was not substantial, combined with the drop in the attendance of principals and teachers, it makes for a poor beginning for Year 2.

Parents continued their poor attendance record of Year 1 with only about half of those on core teams taking part in CANAL training, Table 10. They had an inadequate number of members on the teams to begin with and with only about half of those few attending training, they made a far more limited contribution than anticipated by the CANAL model.

Table 10 shows that community members were almost entirely absent from Day 1 training with only two of the potential 61 attendees present. So while the number of community members placed on the teams showed a slight increase over Year 1, they took no active part in the opening training session for Year 2.

Attendance data from Day 1 training in Year 2 show that CANAL staff compounded their failure to deal with the problem of the composition of core planning teams in Year 2 with poor attendance at their first major training activity. In fact, the opening session had attendance rates that fell below any of the sessions offered in Year 1.

---

[4] See Tables 8, p. 27 and 12, p. 38, Day 1 and Day 2 training in The Year-End Progress Report of Monitoring Project CANAL Year 1: An Analysis of the Composition and Participation of Core Planning Teams.

Table 11 describes attendance with respect to the number of teams that had 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4 or more members attending who represented ancillary staff, parents and community members. (Note again that the base for the table is 43 in that 39 teams participated once and two teams participated twice in Day 1 training.)

The proposal required a minimum of three ancillary staff for each team. Table 11 shows that six teams had no ancillary staff present, 11 had only one, and 19 had only two in attendance. Thus, the criterion of three or more ancillary members was met by only seven teams.

Parents showed a similar pattern. While a minimum of five parents were expected to join each team, seven teams had no parents present, eight had only one, nine had only two, and five had only three, Table 11. Only 14 teams had as many as four parents present, and only five of the 14 teams had five or more parents as expected by the CANAL model, (See Table 9 for the number of teams with at least five parents in attendance). The absence of parents was very similar to the pattern established in Year 1.

Only two of the 43 teams had a community member present, showing again that community members ceased to be a serious component of the core planning team.

Core Planning Team Workshop: Day 2

The second day of workshop training again involved all 41 teams participating in CANAL Project. As in Day 1, two schools, Bradwell and Hearst, attended the workshop twice, and again, essentially the same group of individuals from the two schools attended both times. As for Day 1, the reasons for the duplication in attendance were unknown. Another team, Robeson, failed to participate in the Day 2 session. Given the duplicate

attendance of the two teams and the failure of one to attend, 42 sessions were provided with a total potential attendance of 1,049 individuals.

Table 12 details the number of participants for each of the 42 sessions. A comparison of the total number of participants shown in Table 12 to those of Day 1 in Table 9, shows that there was a slight increase in Day 2 attendance. However, the increase was not sufficient to add up to a good attendance. The total number of attendees on Day 1 was 682 while it was 704 on Day 2. The increase is somewhat greater than the numbers suggest in that on Day 2 the team from Robeson with 22 members did not attend, reducing the potential number of attendees. Still, 345 team members failed to show up for Day 2 training (see the sum of the DIFF column).

The only group showing a major increase was that of students. On Day 1 only two students attended while on Day 2, 14 were present. Eleven of the 14 students came from two schools, Dumas and Manierre both of which are elementary schools. In reviewing the core team compositions we found that Dumas had seven students on their core team and six of them attended Day 2. However, Manierre had no students on its core team, yet five came to Day 2 training. It is difficult to understand what the role of elementary students was at the training session, and even more difficult when they are not members of the core planning team. Also, note that the five students from Manierre represented almost a third of the 16 individuals who showed up for the core team. One implication is that the team does not consist of a stable group of individuals, but may be a collection of whoever is willing to come.

Table 12 continued

PARTICIPATION IN CORE PLANNING TEAM WORKSHOPS*

YEAR 2: DAY 2, SEPTEMBER 26 TO OCTOBER 27,1989

Date And School	Category Of Participant												TOTAL	CPT	DIFF
	P	AP	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	OTHER			
October 10															
DuSable			23				1	1					25	31	- 6
Westinghouse		1	15				1	1	1	4			23	32	- 9
October 13															
Bennett	1	1	10			1							13	25	-12
Clark			11			1		1			1		14	27	-13
DePriest	1		8	1	1	1		1	1	4			18	22	- 4
Fernwood	1		10			1				1			13	26	-13
Frazier	1	1	9			1		2		5	1		20	25	- 5
Mayo		1	8			1	1			4			15	22	- 7
October 17															
Bradwell**			12					1	1	10			24	29	- 5
Hearst **		1	8							3			12	21	- 9
Kelvyn Park		1	8						1	2	1		13	21	- 8
Orr	1		14				1			1			17	29	-12
October 19															
Dyett			16			1		1		3	1		22	28	- 6
Guggenheim	1	1	9		1		1						13	25	-12
Howe	1	1	13					1	1	2			19	26	- 7
Terrell		1	14					1	2	3			21	40	-19
Woodson	1	1	12				1			2			17	30	-13
October 27															
Gale	1	1	18		1		1						22	24	- 2
	22	16	464	14	6	13	11	31	14	106	4	3	704	1049	-345

* Data on attendance was provided by staff of the CANAL Project. The core planning teams of schools trained on September 26 received three days of training in this series whereas teams of other schools received two days except for Robeson which did not attend at all. Two schools, DuSable and Westinghouse received both days of training on one day. For purposes of comparison the first two days of attendance for teams receiving three days of training are included with teams receiving only two days. Also, DuSable and Westinghouse attendance for October 10 is displayed here.

** Bradwell attended on September 26 and October 17; Hearst attended on September 29 and October 17. Note that the total for core planning team members is 1049 whereas the original teams were 1021. The difference in this table is due to the teams of Bradwell and Hearst being counted twice and Robeson being absent altogether.

P=principal; Ap=assistant principal; T=teacher; S=student; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; TOTAL=sum of members of a team attending; CPT=total number of individuals on each team; DIFF= difference between the number of attendees and members on each team.

Table 13

PARTICIPATION IN CORE PLANNING TEAM WORKSHOPS: YEAR 2

REPRESENTATION OF KEY CONSTITUENCIES ON DAY 2

Category Of Constituent	Number Of Core Team Members*	In Attendance	
		Number	Percentage
Principals	42	22	52 %
Assistant Principals	0	16	n/a
Teachers	549	464	85 %
Ancillaries	188	78	41 %
Parents	195	106	54 %
Community Members	61	4	7 %
Students	14	14	100 %
Totals	1049	704	67 %

* The number of core team members presented here is greater than those on the original teams because two teams participated twice. Thus, the number reflects the original 41 teams, less one team that did not participate, plus the two teams that attended twice for a total of 42 teams. For example, there was one principal on each of the original 41 teams, less the one whose team did not participate leaving 40. But two must be added because two teams participated twice, for a total of 42. However, only 22 principals were present for the 42 attending teams so slightly more than half, 52 %, of the teams trained did so with the principal present.

** There were no assistant principals on the original core teams, yet on 16 occasions they attended with a team.

***Ancillaries include building engineers, lunch room managers, clerks, teacher aides, and school community representatives.

The data on attendance for Day 2 training reveals no meaningful improvement in core planning team attendance. The attendance pattern established during the first year of CANAL not only persisted but actually got worse in the second year. From the schedule of activities it appears, however, that CANAL staff intend to proceed with training even though appropriate core planning teams failed to materialize.

Recall that six of the schools participated in a special training experience both in terms of the presenter and in that they were provided with three days of training rather than the two days that other teams received. In the foregoing analysis, the first two days of the special training were treated as equivalent to the Day 1 and Day 2 training that other teams received. Table 15 provides a separate display of the participation of the six teams over the three days of special training. Approximately a third of the members of the six core teams did not take part in the training. Bradwell and Carter consistently had the worst attendance, Table 15. Whatever the purpose of the special three-day session, it had little impact on increasing the attendance of core planning team members.

Core Planning Team Total Site Training

As in Year 1, core planning teams were provided with Total Site training. It was total site in the sense that it provided core planning teams with an opportunity to train with the entire school staff. Data was available on 17 of the teams that received Total Site training. One of the teams, Piccolo, was trained in two separate groups so there were actually 18 training sessions.

Table 16 displays the attendance of the 17 teams at the 18 sessions. During Total Site training each school was provided with a cadre of substitute teachers to enable the

Table 16

PARTICIPATION IN TOTAL SITE TRAINING: YEAR 2

17 CORE PLANNING TEAMS: SCHOOL AND CATEGORY OF PARTICIPANTS *

Date And School	Category Of Participant												
	P	AP	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	OTHER	TOTAL
11/1/89 Sherman	1		39					4	2	4			49
11/2/89 Dett	1	1	32		1			5	1	2		1	44
11/6/89 Goldblatt	1		33					1	1	12		2	50
11/8/89 Piccolo (1 of 2)	1		34				2	6	3	9		4	59
11/9/89 Piccolo (2 of 2)	1	1	42			1	3	9	2			6	65
11/10/89 Hearst		1	42					3	1				47
11/11/89 Dyett	1		7						2	10		3	23
11/13/89 Hammond		1	39		2	1	2	9	1	4		2	61
11/14/89 Gale		1	49		1		1	6	2				60
11/16/89 Lowell	1	2	27		2	1		6	2	1		1	43
11/20/89 Sumner			22		1	1	2	1	2	3		1	33
11/21/89 Gregory	1		26	6				1	1	2			37
11/22/89 DuBois	1		19	3	1	1	1	2		3		1	32
11/27/89 Cooper	1		28					4	1	2		1	37
11/30/89 Stowe		1	41				1	4	1	1	1	1	51
12/1/89 Terrell	1	1	31					7	1	2		1	44

*Data on attendance for the 17 teams was provided by staff of Project CANAL

P=principal; Ap=assistant principal; T=teacher; S=student; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member.

entire teaching staff to participate in the training. No attempt was made to assess the proportion of the teachers from each school who actually attended the training sessions.

Table 16 indicates that in every case except Dyett, the number of teachers in attendance was substantial. In the case of Dyett, only seven teachers attended. It is not clear whether the cadre was not available to relieve the teachers at Dyett, or whether the teachers chose not to participate.

Surprisingly, principals of four of the schools failed to attend even though the session was organized specifically for their school. However, in all cases except one, Sumner, an assistant principal was present when the principal was absent.

It also was expected that there would be a substantial representation of ancillary staff. But this was not the case. Only seven of the teams were accompanied by a building engineer, only seven had the lunchroom manager present, and only seven had a school clerk in attendance. The only ancillary staff that were well represented were teacher aides and school community representatives. In all cases but one a teacher aide was present and in only three instances no school community representative was present.

Table 17 summarizes the attendance of ancillaries, parents and community members. It shows that 14 teams had four or more ancillaries, and the remaining four sessions had at least two ancillaries in attendance. Parents and community members, however, did not fare so well. Four of the 18 teams had no parents in attendance, three had only one, four had only two, and two had only three parents present. In only five sessions were there as many as four parents in attendance. Community members continued to be absent from the process in that only one community member attended Total Site training. The evidence shows that core planning teams, as stipulated in the CANAL proposal, simply have not been implemented.

SUMMARY

The potential of CANAL to organize and put in action core planning teams as described in the funded proposal, must be viewed with pessimism. To the extent that the CANAL proposal was correct in the assumption that school-based management requires the participation of a broadly representative group, the potential of CANAL for introducing school-based management to the 41 schools also must be viewed negatively. Even though considerable resources were available, CANAL staff were unable to implement the model put forward in the proposal.

The training in shared decision-making was to enable school administrators, teachers, ancillary staff, parents and community members to bring their various perspectives to bear on school governance and particularly on plans for improving the educational environment. As it turned out, the teams for which the elaborate training was organized, failed to materialize. At the outset they were not properly composed, and the teams that were organized failed to participate in the training that was developed for them. Those who showed up for training were predominantly teachers. The data shows that thus far CANAL staff have not been able to implement the model that was to change the governance of local schools. Even more important, if the original proposal was correct in assuming that the CANAL model was the best way to improve the educational climate in racially identifiable schools, what does the failure to implement the program mean for the schools? And, what does it do to the hopes for raising standards of academic achievement within the schools?

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

MONITORING COMMISSION STAFF

MONITORING COMMISSION STAFF

The Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation's principal investigator Dr. Mary E. Davidson is assisted by primary consultants and full-time Commission staff in monitoring Project CANAL.

Primary consultants are: Joseph E. Hill, Dr. Norman R. Kurtz, Dr. Calvin M. Smith, Jr., and Dr. Doris M. Williams. The principal investigator and primary consultants are experienced in various aspects of research.

Staff assigned in whole or in part to monitor Project CANAL are: Barbara S. Anglin, Barb Leebens-Osilaja, and Christy R. Spears. Other Commission staff assisting include: Helen Jackson and Ana Tapia.

Complete resumes for the principal investigator, primary consultants (except for Mr. Hill), and full-time Commission staff (except for Mrs. Anglin) appeared in the Commission first quarterly report published in February 1989 and therefore, are not reproduced here. Mr. Hill and Mrs. Anglin's resumes follow. Additional copies of all CANAL monitoring reports published by the Monitoring Commission are available at the Commission's office, 1819 W. Pershing Road, 6th Floor East, Chicago, IL 60609.

JOSEPH E. HILL Biographical Data

COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES:

Board of Directors - Evanston North Shore Committee for Urban League, member
Evanston Human Relations Council, president
Mental Health Board, member
Board of Directors - WEAW, member
Board of Directors - Evanston Chamber of Commerce, member
Board of Education for Department of Corrections School District (Illinois), member
Evanston Rotary Club, member of executive committee
Evanston North Shore Branch of NAACP, life member
First Baptist Church of Evanston, member
Evanston Black Non-Partisan Coalition, member
OSPI Desegregation Committee, member
Illinois Office of Education Task Force (Declining Enrollment)
Board of Directors - North Communities Health Plan, member
Board of Directors - Boy Scouts of America (Regional), member

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS:

National Alliance of Black School Educators, treasurer 1973-75
National Alliance of Black School Educators, president-elect 1975-77
National Alliance of Black School Educators, president 1977-79
American Association of Personnel Administrators, Committee for Minority Affairs, Special Advisor to the President and Representative-At-Large
Illinois Association of School Administrators
American Association of School Administrators
American School Boards Association Black Caucus
Committee on Minorities in Engineering, member

CITATIONS AND AWARDS:

Distinguished Citizen by Illinois College Alumni
Distinguished Citizen by Roosevelt University Alumni
Ambassador of Friendship by American Friendship Club
Certificate of Merit by Chessman Club
Outstanding Citizen's Award by Evanston North Shore Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority
Delegate to International Conference, Berlin, Germany (educational exchange)
Service Recognition by National Alliance of Black School Educators
Service Recognition by National School Boards Association Black Caucus
Distinguished Community Service Award, Veterans of Foreign Wars, T/Sgt. Wm. B. Snell Post, Evanston, IL

MILITARY SERVICE:

Army Air Corps, radio operator - 1942-45

FAMILY:

Wife: Carmelia
Sons: George and Joseph Jr.
Daughter: Carmeryl Jan
1 grandson and 2 granddaughters

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

BUDGET STATUS

56

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

Project CANAL

Second Year Budget Detail as of 12/31/89

General Office Supplies		$ 628
Postage		508
Consultant Services as of 12/31/89:		
Expended	$ 46,657	
Encumbered	53,382	
Total Expenditures and Encumbrances		100,039
Printing:		
Mailing Labels	$ 990	
Flyers	308	
Total Printing		1,298
Travel Expenses:		
Hotel	$ 2,405	
Auto Milage	49	
Food	707	
Airfare	1,585	
Local	514	
Miscellaneous	143	
Total Travel		5,403
Furniture/Equipment:		
File Cabinets	$ 956	
Dictaphone	324	
Total Furniture/Equipment		1,280
Total Operating Expenses		**$109,156**